

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **January 4, 2005**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-25. Claims 1-4, 6-7, 13, and 17-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chamberlain et al (USPN 6,408,360, hereinafter “Chamberlain”) in view of Krishnamurthy et al (USPN 6,578,113, hereinafter “Krishnamurthy”). Claims 5, 12, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chamberlain in view of Krishnamurthy and further in view of Bourne et al (USPN 6,584,548, hereinafter “Bourne”). Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chamberlain in view of Krishnamurthy and further in view of Rackson et al (USPN 6,415,270, hereinafter “Rackson”). Claims 8-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chamberlain in view of Krishnamurthy and further in view of Challenger et al (USPN 6,026,413, hereinafter “Challenger”). Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chamberlain in view of Krishnamurthy and further in view of Ekanadham (USPN 5,802,582, hereinafter “Ekanadham”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 6, 13, and 18-20 were rejected as being unpatentable over Chamberlain in view of Krishnamurthy. Applicant respectfully points out that the combined system of Chamberlain and Krishnamurthy teaches invalidating cached data upon an indication **from the data server** that the data is invalid (see Krishnamurthy, col. 2, lines 49-62).

In contrast, the present invention invalidates cached data upon receiving a request **from a client** to change the data by comparing the change request to a set of rules (see page 10, lines 18-22 and page 11, lines 13-21 of the instant application). This is beneficial because the data in the cache is immediately compared to the rules and, if appropriate, invalidated without having to wait for a

round trip message to the data server to invalidate the cached data. There is nothing within Chamberlain or Krishnamurthy, either separately or in concert, which suggests invalidating cached data upon receiving a request from a client to change the data and comparing the request to a set of rules.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 6, 13, and 18-20 to clarify that the present invention invalidates cached data upon receiving a request from a client to change the data and comparing the request to a set of rules. These amendments find support on page 10, lines 18-22 and page 11, lines 13-21 of the instant application. Dependent claims 2 and 22 have been canceled without prejudice. Dependent claims 3 and 23 have been amended to correct antecedent basis.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 6, 13, and 18-20 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-5, which depend upon claim 1, claims 7-12, which depend upon claim 6, claims 14-17, which depend upon claim 13, and claims 21 and 23-25, which depend upon claim 20, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Edward J. Grundler

Registration No. 47,615

Date: January 20, 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-2914
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665